

# THE HIEROPHANT;

OR

## MONTHLY EXPOSITOR OF SACRED SYMBOLS AND PROPHECY.

---

No. VI.—NOVEMBER, 1842.

---

DOUBLE SENSE OF PROPHECY.

TO PROFESSOR STUART.—LETTER III.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

THE large amount of space devoted in your first essay to an exposé of the extravagances of mystical and spiritual interpretation, would seem to imply, that you really believed that such absurdities found patrons in some quarters at the present day; or at least, that they were so *legitimately* the product of the principle of the double sense of prophecy, that the advocates of that principle were responsible for them. Your course of argument, viewed in this light, must be regarded as a virtual call upon them to come forward, and either boldly avow the consequences alleged, in all their length and breadth, or, in renouncing them, to renounce the *principle* itself of which you would hold these consequences to be the natural result. For myself, however, I must be pardoned for declining to do either the one or the other. I see no necessary connexion between the proposition you have assumed to confute, and the cabalistic reveries you have undertaken to expose. That individuals may here and there be found capable of relishing, and perhaps of originating, such wild conceits, such dreamy deductions, such puerile crudities, such mystic monstrosities, as you have cited, is very possible. If there are, let them be reasoned, rebuked, or ridiculed out of their hallucination, if the thing is practicable—if they are not those “upon whose nature,” as the great dramatist says, “nurture will never stick.” Some errors can scarcely be corrected without being excoriated, and no one at all acquainted with the history of her-

meneutics, but must be aware of the huge masses of nonsense which have grown out of a spiritualizing tendency in weak interpreters. But why these allegorical dotings should be scourged over the back of the double sense of *prophecy*, I am utterly at a loss to divine. Why a principle which ever has been, and still is maintained by multitudes of the soundest and soberest divines in all ages of the church, should be placed in the same category with the idlest rabbinical rhodomontade—why a scholar writing for scholars should, in a grave treatise on the principles of biblical hermeneutics, virtually put what they regard as a fundamental canon of interpretation on a par with such obsolete and exploded fatuities—is a problem which I am wholly unable to solve. Notwithstanding all the deference which I am constrained to pay to the years, the rank, the authority of the patriarch of sacred literature in this country, I cannot but ask myself whether this is showing a due and decorous respect to an opinion which he must admit has some plausible reasons to be urged in its behalf, and which is by no means deserving the disparagement that is thus, by association, thrown upon it. Is it, in a word, a fair, a liberal, a scholar-like mode of treating the subject? Are the opinions and the arguments of such men as Warburton, Daubuz, Lowth, Chandler, Horsley, Vitranga, the elder Michaelis, the modern Olshausen, Hartmann, and a host of others, who have advocated this doctrine, of no account,—worthy of no notice or reply—while the superlative sillinesses of the dark ages, and all manner of ‘old wives’ fables’ are brought forward into the foreground of the discussion, as if these were all the arguments that were to be met? I had supposed that from a Professor of Biblical Exegesis we might look for an attempt to cope with the fundamental grounds of the doctrine, as maintained by intelligent advocates, instead of a strange waste of warfare with a man of straw, or at least with the gaseous ghost of a theory long since defunct. Certain it is, that as the general adoption of *your* views on this subject, must necessarily work a complete change in the views which have been and still are extensively held, particularly by the elder class of divines in this country, you can have no reasonable grounds to expect that such a revolution of sentiment will take place, except by showing conclusively the falsity of the established belief. And this must be done in some other way than by merely exposing the *abuse* to which it may be liable. The true strength of the argument must be grappled with. If the grand argument against any theological or exegetical thesis that may be propounded, is the *abuses* of which it may be susceptible by perversion or distortion, what tenet will escape unscathed?

But I am ready to admit that, although I find on this head a great deal of irrelevant matter in your first essay, yet you do at length come more directly to the grand point in debate, which obviously is, not whether the principle of double sense is capable of

abuse, but whether it is *true*. After detailing a long catalogue of mystical triflings, you say :

"It is well that the public taste is at last putting its hand more and more upon the extravagance of days that are past, in respect to the occult sense of many portions of the Scriptures. But in the department of prophecy, with which I am particularly concerned at present, there is yet great latitude given and taken in regard to this matter. In the Psalms, and indeed in a multitude of passages in the Prophets, the Pentateuch, and all parts of Scripture, there are expositors even now who defend the *exoteric*, i. e. they find a literal and historic sense which answered in former days a *temporary* purpose, and also an occult sense, wrapped up or involved in the historic sense, and discernible only when this is laid aside. They are serious in the belief that they have a right to interpret in this manner ; and although few will venture to meet a discussion on the ground of simple hermeneutics, (for on this ground their cause must surely fail,) yet they appeal, one and all, to the usage and authority of the New Testament writers, and aver, that whatever difficulties may be made out on the grounds of hermeneutical science, as applicable to writings of merely human origin, yet it is clear that the Evangelists and other writers of the New Testament did admit and adopt a double sense of the Hebrew Scriptures, and, consequently, we are at liberty to do the same."—pp. 29, 30.

Your language evidently betrays no small degree of wonder that any one can be 'serious' in the belief that certain prophecies should contain a literal sense that answered a *temporary* purpose in one age of the church, and another inwrapped or spiritual sense, which answered a further and a *permanent* purpose at a subsequent period. I, for my part, must be allowed to express an equal degree of wonder that any one can be 'serious' in denying it. Be assured, my dear sir, I am *soberly* 'serious' in believing that I 'have a right to interpret in this manner,' and not only so, I am perfectly ready to 'meet a discussion of the subject on the simple ground of hermeneutics,' and as to the ominous intimation that the 'cause on this ground must surely fail,' I leave that to be decided by the issue. I cannot say, however, that the certainty of defeat is my principal motive for engaging in the conflict.

The unanimous appeal, of which you here speak, on the part of the advocates of a double sense, to the usage and authority of the New Testament writers, leads you directly to the consideration of the question, whether these writers "have made out, in any case, a *double* sense to the words of the Old Testament Scriptures?" To the discussion of this question the rest of your essay is devoted, and the decision to which you come is in the *negative*. With this decision, however, I am less concerned than with the reasonings by which you would fain establish it.

"I do not find but *two* ways in which the Jewish Scriptures are employed in the New Testament, so far as the subject of prediction or prophecy is concerned. The first is too plain to need any particular comment ; it is where a passage in the Old Testament is simply and directly prophetic, and is appealed to or cited as merely prophetic. Such are the

passages, as I must believe, cited from Is. LIII, Ps. II. XVI. XXII. XLV. CX., and many other places. We need not, with Cocceius, Bishop Horne, and other writers of this description, find Christ *everywhere* in the Old Testament; nor need we, as has been said of Grotius, come to the conclusion that he is to be found *nowhere* in it. There is some middle path between these extremes."—pp. 31, 32.

As to the particular instances to which you here advert, I have no grounds for differing from you in the opinion, that the Psalms in question do refer directly, primarily, and, if you please, exclusively, to Christ. But I have still something to offer on the manner in which your statement is made. "The first is where a passage in the Old Testament is simply and directly prophetic, and is appealed to or is cited as merely prophetic." This mode of quotation you say "is too plain to need any particular comment." Now whether it be owing to want of perspicacity in me, or of perspicuity in you, I am constrained to say, that the position is one which to my own mind needs a *great deal* of comment in order to make it, I will not say intelligible in itself, but pertinent to the point at issue. This point is, whether the writers of the New Testament have in any case made out a *double sense* to the Old Testament Scriptures. You affirm that there are numerous passages in the Old Testament predicting a Messiah, and that these are 'appealed to and cited' as such. Now the true question is, *what form of appeal and citation* is requisite on the part of the New Testament writers, in order to *authenticate* a Messianic construction of such passages, and to assure us that *no other* is admissible. The appeal, according to your own showing, must be an *authoritative* appeal, or it is of no avail toward disentangling the subject of its perplexities. The point, therefore, on which I especially crave information is this:—What is it that constitutes, in the language of Christ and the apostles, an *authoritative exposition* of an Old Testament text in a Messianic sense? Is it a simple *allusion* to such a text, in speaking of Christ or his kingdom? Is it a partial or entire *adoption of the express words* of the Old Testament writer? Or is it necessary we should have a *formal and unequivocal declaration* affirming that such and no other is the true meaning of the Holy Spirit in this, that, and the other passage? You are well aware that it would be no easy matter to find a single instance where a *formal declaration*, such as I have here hinted at, occurs. We meet indeed often with the introductory formula, 'that it might be fulfilled,' but your own remarks are very decided to the point, that this mode of expression is used in numerous instances to denote simply the *resemblance* of a later to an earlier thing, of which the one is called in the New Testament diction the *fulfilment* of the other. For the most part, the Old Testament Scriptures are referred to in a very *incidental* manner, and so as to leave it still doubtful whether we are *shut up* to a particular construction of the texts which Christ or the apostles have in view.

I repeat, then, that I am unable to learn, from the words in which you have expressed yourself, what it is that constitutes such an appeal or citation as I am bound to consider *authoritative* as to the prophetic sense involved in the passage. Nor do I find any criterion afforded by which I am to determine whether, in case a single verse in a particular Psalm, for example, has reference to Christ, the whole Psalm is to be regarded as pointing exclusively to him. Let us take, for instance, the 89th Psalm, of which the *nominal* subject, at least, is certainly David and his seed, and in which occurs the following language:—v. 4, 5, “I have sworn unto David my servant, thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations.” Again, v. 27, 29, “Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven.” Now in speaking of the 45th Psalm, you say that it cannot apply to Solomon because, among other reasons, ‘his throne was not forever and ever.’ But this obviously is just as true of David’s throne as of Solomon’s. And if so, have we not the same reason in his case as in the other to say, ‘a greater than David is here’? Must we not recognise the Messiah under the human designation in both cases? If so, I am unable myself to perceive why these names have not, when viewed in this light, a *double sense*; but this is not at the present moment the precise point of my remark. While we should undoubtedly both of us agree in the Messianic interpretation of the passages before us, the question still remains, *by what rule, or by what authority*, we establish it. If it be replied that the angel’s words to Mary, Luke 1: 32, 69, fully substantiate this sense, then I would respectfully inquire, whether that inspired application of these particular texts to the Messiah necessitates the reference of *the whole Psalm* to him? Should your answer be in the affirmative, I would request an exposition of the verses from v. 38 to the end of the chapter. Who is intended by the Psalmist when he says, “Thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed. Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant, thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground. Thou hast broken down all his hedges; thou hast brought his strong holds to ruin. All that pass by the way spoil him: he is a reproach to his neighbors. Thou hast set up the right hand of his adversaries; thou hast made all his enemies to rejoice. Thou hast also turned the edge of his sword, and hast not made him to stand in the battle. Thou hast made his glory to cease, and cast his throne down to the ground. The days of his youth hast thou shortened: thou hast covered him with shame”? On the contrary, if you reply in the negative, and admit that this part of the Psalm has reference to another subject, such an admission comes into serious conflict with that part of your essay where you inveigh with such a loud note of remonstrance

against the idea of applying one part of a Psalm to one subject, and another to another.

Let us recur, then, once more to the real purport of your remark respecting the New Testament mode of quotation from the Old. 'The first,' you say, 'is where a passage is appealed to or is cited as merely prophetic.' By '*merely prophetic*' you obviously mean as contradistinguished from having a *secondary* sense. Such passages you admit there are, having respect to Christ and his kingdom, and your object is to prove that this their ultimate, is also their single and exclusive sense. And you admit, that "if the Old Testament Scriptures have not predicted a Messiah, and have not often predicted him, then the persuasion and reasoning of Christ and his apostles, in respect to this subject, have no good foundation on which they can rest." Still you refuse to concede that these predictions have in any case an occult or double sense. "If they have foretold a Messiah, why not leave them to speak out this great truth plainly, simply, and without any *ὑπορροία* or double sense?" I can readily conceive, and shall hereafter state, a number of very good reasons for this shaded and obscure kind of announcement; but my purpose at present is to put to the test the soundness of your whole theory respecting the New Testament mode of quotation, and the inference you draw from it, viz. that it involves no proof of the doctrine of a double sense.

I see not how it is possible to deny, that many of the principal predictions, which announce a Messiah, have a *literal* reference to other persons and to other events, more especially to David or Solomon. For example, in 2 Sam. 7: 12, 13, 16, "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever and ever. . . . And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." It is evident that this is not exclusively predicable of David, any more than the 45th Psalm is of Solomon. The throne of his kingdom certainly was not 'established forever.' A greater than David is here. And yet David is here; and if the Messiah is spoken of at all, it is under the person of David. Why, then, is not this a double sense? By what sort of exegetical juggle is it possible to get rid of a sense which may be called, with the strictest propriety, *secondary*? That this prophecy has indeed a reference to the Messiah, is clear from the words of Peter, Acts 2: 30, "Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, *he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne*, he seeing this before, spake," &c. The question now remains to be determined whether this promise had any relation whatever to David or to Solomon. You

must construe the matter as your adopted canons dictate. For myself, I see no reason to doubt that the prophecy had respect in a *primary* sense to David and Solomon, and in a *secondary* to Christ.

I am well aware of your reply :

"All that can with strict propriety be said of these and of many other like cases, is simply, that the sacred writers of ancient times, when they come to disclose a future king Messiah and his peaceful reign, borrow the costume of their picture from objects then before their own minds and those of their readers. From David and Solomon traits of resemblance are borrowed, in order to complete the resemblance of a future king. Not mere choice, but absolute necessity dictated this. How could the future be disclosed, except by language borrowed from that in present use, and by likenesses drawn from present objects? It is surely no good reason for finding a double sense, that a prophet has undertaken to disclose the future, by presenting it through similitudes of the present." —pp. 32, 33.

Here we have the crucible in which the principle of a genuine double sense is to be melted down into mere 'traits of resemblance.' The sacred writers, 'when they come to disclose a future king Messiah and his extended and peaceful reign, *borrow the costume* of their picture from objects then before their own minds and those of their readers.' What is this, when stripped of the 'borrowed costume' of an artificial mode of expression, and translated into plain English, but an admission of the very point for which I am contending? Present personages, objects, and facts, are employed as a vehicle for conveying prophetic intimations. David's throne is Messiah's throne. Solomon's tranquil reign is the Messiah's kingdom of peace and bliss. The daughter of Tyre and her virgin companions are the Gentile peoples, brought into participation of the blessings of the gospel. If this be not a double sense, pray what is? You may disguise it and mystify it by a strained phraseology, calling it 'costume,' 'likeness,' 'traits of resemblance,' &c., but here is the stubborn fact, nevertheless, of a plain, obvious, downright *double sense*,

"Which all the more it seeks to hide itself,  
The bigger bulk it shows."

Yet we are told that 'it is surely no good reason for finding a double sense, that a prophet has undertaken to disclose the future by presenting it through similitudes of the present.' That is to say, that the very arguments which go to establish a point beyond controversy, do not prove the point at all!

But in this connexion, allow me to submit to your consideration the following passage from a prediction of Ezekiel relative to the nation of Israel, ch. 34: 23, 24, "And I will set up one shepherd over them, even my servant David, and he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd, and I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them." Strictly parallel intimations, are to be read, Jer. 30: 9; Hos. 3: 5; Ezek. 37: 24, 25.

As the literal David had been long dead when this prophecy was uttered, and as I presume you do not entertain the idea of his being raised from the dead in order to accomplish it, it seems a point of some difficulty to avoid the conclusion that the personage really meant is no other than the Messiah. If so, in what sense is the word 'David' to be understood here? Certainly not in its plain, primary, literal sense. And yet, as you deny a double sense, will you favor me with some thread that shall guide me out of the *anfractuons* windings of this labyrinth of prophetic diction. The only solution that I obtain from your book is, that David is here a 'costume,' a 'similitude,' and when I ask you how that differs from employing his name in a double sense, Echo answers 'how!'

But this train of remark leads you to consider a second method in which the New Testament writers have cited and employed the language of the Old Testament, viz. *by suggesting resemblances between past and future events*. As your former head did in fact resolve itself into a *suggestion of resemblances*, I am unable to perceive the precise point of difference between the two; but not to insist upon this, let us canvass the proposition itself, which is the more important, as you discuss under it the general doctrine of *types* and *typical informations*.

"This includes all which is properly called *type* in the Old Testament. Type means a resemblance of two *things*, not an occult sense of words. The epistle to the Hebrews has shown us, that many things under the old dispensation were, and were designed to be, *typical*, i. e. they bore a resemblance to objects or transactions of the new dispensation. It is through the medium of this epistle that we come more fully to learn, that many of the Jewish religious rites were typical. Indeed, we cannot well conceive how it should be otherwise. God has no pleasure in rites, forms, ceremonies, and sacrifices, in themselves considered, and for their own sake. To be worthy of him, they must shadow forth something of the future and Messianic dispensation. Thus the paschal-lamb was a type of the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world; the office of the high-priest was typical of the atoning and propitiatory office of Christ; and the like as to many other things. But in all these cases, and in all like to them, there is nothing of a double sense to *words*. The *words* which describe the rites, sacrifices, or occurrences, of the ancient dispensation, are to be interpreted in their plain, usual, and historical sense; for example, the institution of the passover in Ex. 12. When this is done, an interpreter, so far as the exegesis of mere language is concerned, has fully discharged his duty. But another question may arise subsequent to this, viz. Whether the *things* thus described do not afford resemblances of future things under the new dispensation? Christ and the apostles have decided that they do; and even more than this is apparently decided, for they seem plainly to teach us that many of the ancient rites and transactions, and persons also, *were designed to be types of good things to come*. It is this which makes them truly types. Surely it is not every resemblance which fancy can draw, between an earlier and a later occurrence or personage, that constitutes a type in a true and scriptural sense. We must limit types of this character only to such things or persons as were designed to afford resemblances that might convey instruction to the ancient church."—pp. 33, 34.



Here I am troubled again by a similar lack of lucidity in your phraseology to that of which I complained above. To say that one method of quoting the Old Testament is by 'suggesting resemblances between things past and future,' comes very far short of conveying those definite ideas on the subject, which a matter of so much moment demands. I obtain from it no clear conception bearing directly on the disproof of a double sense; for resemblances may be suggested in a great variety of ways, and in hundreds of instances they suggest themselves without the aid of a New Testament quotation to point them out. Your object obviously is to get rid of the evidence of double sense drawn from the use of *typical* persons and things in the old economy; and in order to this, the first step is to fuse down and evaporate the true nature of a type by bringing it under a definition, or into a category, which would represent it as a mere 'resemblance,' which, however, is directly contradicted by your subsequent explanations. 'Many things under the old dispensation were *typical*, i. e. bore a resemblance to objects or transactions of the new dispensation.' But then, as if aware that the very troublesome question might be asked, whether *mere resemblance* constitutes one thing a type of another, you subsequently add, that it is not every resemblance that constitutes a type in a true and scriptural sense, and that it is only those resemblances which were *designed* to be types, that we are to recognise as such. It is the *design*, in fact, which makes them types; consequently we are not to regard any resemblances as typical except those which are expressly certified in some way to be such. Again, you are very anxious to impress upon your reader that because the New Testament writers recognise in the Old Testament typical *things*, or *things* with a double sense, it by no means follows that we must admit *words* with a double sense. The *words* which describe these types are to be interpreted in their plain, usual, historical sense, as in the case of the Passover; and the interpreter has fully discharged his duty, so far as the mere exegesis of language is concerned, by fixing this plain, historical sense. Very well; this is an important part of the interpreter's task, and he may stop here if he chooses; but I will beg him, in the mean time, to lend an ear to a few remarks on both the above postulates.

First, as to the nature of types. 'Type is a resemblance of two things.' This is a very defective definition, because, according to your own subsequent showing, it is *more* than a mere resemblance. It must be a *designed* resemblance; it must have the force of *institution* to make it a type; and not only so, it must be *declared*, in some way or other, to possess this character, before we can be authorized to regard it as such. The bed of your definition is shorter than that the subject-matter can stretch itself upon it, and though you may say that your grand object here is to distinguish between types of *things* and types of *words*, yet the ar-

gument imposes upon you the necessity of giving us clearly your idea of the essential nature of a type. If you approximate somewhat nearer to this in the sequel, it is still at the expense of your main position, that type is resemblance, and that the New Testament writers in recognising types in the Old Testament, do it merely in the way of 'suggesting resemblances.'

As to the theory itself, I partly agree with it, and partly dissent from it. I am willing to concede that a type is a *designed* resemblance between two things, and that it is the *design* which constitutes the essence of the type, though I have some doubts whether even this restricted sense can be fairly made out from the scriptural usage of the term; but when it is contended, in addition to this, that the design must be directly or indirectly *declared*, by the authority of inspiration, before we can be at liberty to recognise one thing as typical of another, I am forced at once to demur. The *fact* of the design is one thing, the *declaration* of it entirely another. Why this design may not often be discovered without the guidance of divine authority, entirely passes my apprehension. I am therefore far from assenting to the general principle so oracularly laid down in another paragraph in relation to the double sense, and which applies equally to the doctrine of type:

"We take the ground that the New Testament writers were *inspired*. And if they were, then it is possible that they might be enlightened by inspiration so as to give a meaning to some parts of the Old Testament Scripture, which is and must be occult in itself to all who are uninspired. We may indeed now follow in their steps, in those cases where they have given us an occult sense; we may give credit to their *authority*, and so trust them as our guides; but we can go, in such a case, no further than they lead the way. Inspiration was necessary to reveal an occult sense to them; and as we are not inspired, so we cannot give the occult sense of passages which they have not explained. In the case supposed, it was not fancy, imagination, conceit, which led them to play upon words, and to give to them mysterious and conjectural meanings. If they have actually exhibited the occult sense in any case, it must of course have been by virtue of light from above."—pp. 30, 31.

I say I do not assent to this principle, because I do not see sufficient evidence of its truth. If I am assured that, *as a general fact*, the Old Testament dispensation was a typical dispensation, or, as you say, that 'the paschal lamb, the Jewish sacrifices at large, the high priest's office, and many other things of the like nature (how much does this include?) are designedly emblems of the future,' I am utterly at a loss to perceive on what grounds I am debarred from the exercise of my sober judgment in assigning a typical import to numerous features of the system, which are not expressly designated as such by Christ and his apostles. Especially am I embarrassed by this view, when I hear you ask, 'If the Jewish dispensation was designed to be *preparatory* to the Christian one, what less could be rationally expected than that there should be such a significance

in many of its institutions?" This query I endorse with all my heart. It is certainly the fairest presumption in the world, that as the Jewish economy was introductory to the Christian, it should, under the veil of its personages, rites, institutions, and ordinances, as typical appointments, enwrap the latent ultimate truths and realities of the gospel scheme. If, as Tholuck remarks, the *ψύχη*, the *informing spirit* of the New Testament, is contained in the chrysalis envelopment of the Old, what wonder that it should frequently show signs of vitality? But that every one of the emblematic items must be distinctly specified and *labelled* as such by the New Testament writers; that *nothing*—absolutely *nothing*—should be recognised by us as such without an express divine warrant; that we should be preremptorily precluded from the *least* exercise of our own discretion in the particular application of a general principle unequivocally affirmed, appears to me one of the most violent and *unreasonable* of all possible conclusions. And upon what is it built? What is the head and front of the reasonings urged in its defence? Why, forsooth, that the principle is liable to abuse; that if granted, it will open the door to all manner of mystic extravagance; that the most licentious and ridiculous modes of interpretation will everywhere gain currency, to the disparagement and unspeakable injury of revelation. Now, that the principle is *capable* of perversion and excess, I have again and again admitted; but I must still be allowed to say, that I have no sympathy with the extreme sensitiveness and alarm often evinced on this score, and which betray themselves so perpetually in your speculations on the subject. I have some confidence in the conservative intelligence and good sense of the mass of the Christian mind of this age, nor will I sacrifice to a vague panic a principle, which under the guidance of an ordinary sobriety of mind can do no harm, but opens a rich source of instruction to the pious reader of the Bible.

Indeed, on the score of dangers to be apprehended to the cause of sound biblical exposition, from the excesses of the *typical* principle, I confess that they appear of a far less threatening aspect than those that spring from the opposite theory. As it is obviously a much less vicious mode of interpretation to find Christ *everywhere* in the Old Testament than to find him *nowhere*, so the *tendency* to the one extreme is proportionably more innoxious than that to the other. I admit the tendency on my ground, and I presume you will not deny it on yours. Still I would contend that a spiritualizing proclivity is fraught with far less mischief to the interests of scriptural truth than that cold, skeptical, and rationalistic style of exegesis, which refuses to admit a gleam of gospel light except where the rays are concentrated to the focus of a *jure divino* type. Such an interpreter seems to me to read his Bible as Shylock did his bond—nothing to be admitted but what is there expressly 'nominated.' My spirit is chilled by this iron rigor of re-

quisition. I am impatient of a restriction that binds me down to the bare cortex of the letter, when all the impressions and impulses of my soul assure me, that God designs that I shall go beyond it, and feed on the inner succulence of this tree of life. I seem to myself to be, on your theory, 'in the school of one *Tyrannus*,' who brandishes the rod of exegetic flagellation without mercy over the slightest yielding to the promptings of spiritual emotion. You may say that *emotion* is sadly out of place in the department of hermeneutics, and that every thing should bend to the clear, cool decisions of the intellect. I would not of course set religious feeling in the 'seat of judgment' where the great canons of interpretation are to be decided upon or applied, but I must still be allowed to say, that in reading the lively oracles I do not covet that state of mind which would shrink, as with an instinct of sacrilege, from recognising a *designed* typical coincidence between a hundred things which are not expressly affirmed to sustain that relation to each other. Nor am I governed in this by mere feeling. The coolest and calmest decisions of my reason assure me of the soundness of this view. When I learn, upon the highest of all authority, that the law was, as a whole, 'a shadow of good things to come;' when its very genius was typical; when I find that types are expressly recognised by the New Testament writers in several instances where the resemblance is extremely remote, and not one reader in a thousand would have thought, without such an intimation, of discovering it; on what ground of reason, by what rule of exegesis, am I forbidden to recognise such an import when the resemblance is so palpably striking that my eyes must be hermetically sealed not to perceive it? Take the case, for instance, mentioned by the apostle, Gal. 4: 22—31, respecting Sarah and Hagar, of whom he affirms an allegoric character, and says that 'these are two covenants,' the one gendering to bondage, and the other to liberty; am I required to believe that these two personages are typical, and yet that no such relation is sustained by Joseph, or Samson, by Solomon, or Jeshua, or Zerubbabel, because it is not expressly affirmed? Look, for a moment at the history of Joseph, and say whether it is probable that its typical adaptations are altogether accidental. Like him the Saviour was the dearly beloved of his Father. Like him he came to seek his brethren in the wilderness of this world, and like him when "he came to his own, his own received him not." Joseph's brethren stripped him of his garments which his father had made for him; and of Christ it is said that "they parted my garments among them, and on my vesture they cast lots." Joseph was cast into a pit, but remained not long there; the Lord Jesus was laid in the grave, but saw no corruption. Joseph was sold by the advice of Judah for twenty pieces of silver; Christ was sold by Judas for thirty. Joseph was cast into a dungeon with two noted criminals; Christ was crucified

between two thieves. Joseph prophetically adjudged the one criminal to life and the other to death ; Christ adjudged one of the thieves to everlasting life, while the other was left to expire without any such assurance. Joseph, emerging from his prison, became the prime-minister of Pharaoh, with a herald crying before him, "bow the knee;" Christ, rising from the prison of the tomb, took his seat at the Father's right hand, having "received a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus *every knee should bow*." Joseph knew his brethren when they knew not him, and though he was severe at first, yet his bowels yearned towards them, and he finally made himself known to them, to the rejoicing of their hearts, though they were filled with shame and bitter sorrow when they looked upon their injured brother ; Christ also knew his brethren while they were rejecting him, and he too will at last make himself known to them in their conversion, and though forgiven, they shall "mourn when they look upon him whom they have pierced."

Here is certainly a very wonderful accumulation of coincidences in the character and history of the two personages set before us, and such as we can scarcely consider as merely casual, and yet Joseph is nowhere *affirmed* to be a type of Christ, nor could I perhaps *prove* that he was. Yet why the typical analogy is not as strongly marked as in the case of Sarah and Hagar, I am wholly unable to see. So again, we are nowhere told that the deliverance of Israel from Egypt—their passage through the Red Sea—their wanderings in the wilderness under the guidance of the Cloudy Pillar—their conquest of the Canaanites and subsequent establishment in the land of promise—were designed to shadow forth the various corresponding realities in the life and experience of the Christian, and yet nothing could be intrinsically more admirably adapted to do it. So we are not expressly assured that the law of the leper, the law of the *goël* or near kinsman, the ordinance of the red heifer, the festival of the jubilee, had either of them a typical design, and yet I cannot refrain from viewing them in that light, nor do I feel myself chargeable with licentious presumption or fanciful vagary in so doing.

I submit, then, whether on the score of consequences the danger from this source is so very serious. Is it not far more derogatory to the word of God to emasculate it of all spiritual import except that for which we have a verbatim and literatim warrant ? On this head I am happy to find myself sustained by an authority so high as that of your respected colleague, the Rev. Dr. Woods, who, in his 'Essay on Inspiration,' p. 131, thus expresses himself:—"It is plain from Luke 24 : 27 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 10—12, and from many other places in the New Testament, that Christ, as well as his apostles, considered the Old Testament as abounding with predictions concerning himself. And it is a fair inference from the representa-

tions they have made, that *the Old Testament must contain many more predictions of Christ, than what are cited in the New.* Accordingly, I am led to think that those writers who are loth to admit any passages in the Old Testament to have been intended as predictions of Christ are, to say the least, quite as far from the truth, as those who see types and prophecies in every chapter."

But as my limits will not allow of any further examination of your views in regard to scriptural types, I must defer the remainder of my remarks on that subject to my next number.

With much respect,

Your friend and brother, GEO. BUSH.

#### THE JUDGMENT OF THE BEAST AND THE LITTLE HORN, SUCCEEDED BY THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM OF THE SAINTS.

EXPOSITION OF DANIEL VII. 9-28.

[CONTINUED.]

THE vision of the prophet was prolonged till he saw the Beast slain and his body given to the burning flame. This was the result of the judgment which sat upon him. Instead of hearing a sentence passed in the celestial court, he saw its execution. The catastrophe was undoubtedly effected by a *gradual* process. This we think is clearly intimated in the parallel words of the hierophantic angel, v. 26, "The judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end," implying a continuance of consumption until the prediction is completed. Both forms of expression convey to the mind the idea, not of an instantaneous, but a progressive work of destruction. In fact, the true idea is to conceive the judgment as running parallel with the career of the Beast from the time the thrones were first placed or planted, and this we shall show in the sequel to have been prior to the ascension of Christ, at which time the kingdom and dominion over all nations and languages were given him. As to the doom of dejection into the burning flame, there is no ground to question that it is the same with the fate of the same power, as more fully described, Rev. 19: 20, "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, and with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that had worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." The "false prophet" of John is the same as the "little horn" of Daniel, and we see them here involved in the same perdition. But it will

be noticed that nothing is here said of the *slaying* of either at the time of their being cast into the burning flame. They are cast into it *alive*. Whatever may be meant by the "lake of fire and brimstone," the same is undoubtedly meant by the "burning flame," into which Daniel saw the body of the Beast cast, and the symbolical scope of the whole we shall consider as we proceed.

The imagery before us should be accurately scanned. The prophet first beholds the Beast *slain*. His mystical life becomes extinct, and then, at some subsequent period, his *body* is given to the burning flame. These are two distinct stages in the destruction of the Beast, and may have occurred at a very considerable interval apart, though we are not furnished in the vision itself with any specific data by which to determine the length of this interval. As a beast in prophecy stands for a kingdom or empire, the slaying a beast must plainly represent the taking away of the political power of that kingdom, which we know is usually effected by the sword of an invading and conquering power; and this is an act very properly expressed by the original term *לַחַיִּים*, from *לָחַץ* to slay, which the lexicons render by *necare, trucidare, interfecire, mactare*, implying a slaughter by the sword, and of which Buxtorf remarks (Lex. Talm. voc. *לָחַץ*), that it answers in the Targums to the Heb. *לָחַץ* when that word signifies to fall by the sword. If, then, the fourth Beast adumbrates the Roman empire, the slaying of the Beast must signify the violent extinction of the imperial life of that empire; and this would naturally be by the mortal wounding of the head, the supreme power, in which the unity of the empire, and its political life are concentrated. Whether this is the same thing with the deadly wound of the Beast, mentioned Rev. 13: 3, "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death (Gr. *ισφαγμένην, slain*)," would seem at first view somewhat difficult to be determined, inasmuch as this *slaying* of the Beast appears to be its extinction under Augustulus, which of course can hardly be supposed to have happened by reason of the great words of the Little Horn, as this Horn did not arise till *after* the empire received its deadly wound by the hands of the Goths. Still it is possible that a very great degree of precision on this head was not intended. It may be sufficient to understand the drift of the vision, as designed to present us *mainly* with a view of the destruction of the Beast, and as his final, fiery, and most signal doom was owing to the procurement of the Little Horn, therefore that which is strictly predicable of a particular period of his history, and of a particular form of his being, is affirmed, in a general way, of the whole. While the *burning* only is in fact owing to the malign influence of the Little Horn, yet the *slaying* is spoken of somewhat indiscriminately, as if that also were to be referred to the same cause, when in fact it took place before the Little Horn arose. One thing is undeniably certain; the Beast of Daniel is identical with the Beast of John. But

the Beast of John, *in the state in which he comes to his end*, is not then slain, but is expressly said to be cast alive into the lake of fire and brimstone. How then are we to reconcile the catastrophe described by the former prophet with that described by the latter, unless we admit that the *slaying* occurred at a period long anterior to the *burning*? And when could the Roman Beast be said to have been slain unless at the extinction of his life by the sword of war wielded by the invading nations whom history recognises as its executioners? We do not, however, propound this view with absolute confidence. We suggest it as a matter deserving of very grave inquiry, inasmuch as it is an object of the last importance to establish every possible point of coincidence and identity between the Beast of Daniel and the Beast of John. And in order to present this point more distinctly to the reader, and to avail ourselves of the light of subsequent inspired expositions of Daniel's visions, we shall exhibit the parallelism in a tabellated form.

## DAN. 7: 2—28.

Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and behold the four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.

After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; and it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things. Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, and whose look was more stout

## REV. 13: 1—9.

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names



than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hands until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart.

are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear.

Chap. 17: 7—14.

And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast that thou sawest, was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition; and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world,) when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is. And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.

We have given the visions in full, that the reader may perceive at a glance the points of coincidence and diversity. Both are somewhat numerous. They agree in the following particulars:

(1.) The Beasts have a common origin, both rising out of the sea.

(2.) They are both represented as fierce, savage, and terrible.

(3.) Both are distinguished by an array of ten horns.

(4.) Both have mouths uttering blasphemy.

(5.) Both exercise a despotic and persecuting power over the saints.

(6.) The mystical period allotted to the existence of both is the same, viz. 1260 days

The evidence of the identity of the mystic monsters afforded by these items is obviously striking and strong, too much so, we think, to be countervailed by the following particulars in which they differ, for these may be properly explained on the ground of the more minute expansion of the imagery to be found in the latter prophet.

(1.) Nothing is said in Daniel of the *heads* of the Beast. John mentions seven, and, as the body of the Beast is obviously composed of the aggregate of the three preceding Beasts, it is a fair presumption that the heads of the fourth or Roman Beast, are derived from those of his predecessors.

(2.) The ten horns of John's Beast are represented as crowned. Nothing is said in Daniel of the crowns.

(3.) John gives no intimation of the eleventh or little horn, which is so conspicuous in Daniel. But it would be easy to show that John has an equivalent for it in the two-horned Beast that rose out of the earth, otherwise called the False Prophet.

(4.) John beheld one of the heads of his Beast wounded to death, and the deadly wound again healed, of which Daniel says nothing express, though we shall endeavor to show that a latent allusion to it may be detected in his words.

(5.) The description of Daniel seems to afford no foundation for the very remarkable character given by John of his Beast in the following words: "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottemless pit, and go into perdition." And again, "The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." But here also, we believe, a closer inspection of Daniel will detect the hidden link, which, in this point, connects the vision of the two prophets; and to this we shall now more especially direct our remarks.

The consent of the great mass of expositors in recognising the Roman empire as shadowed out, both by the Beast of Daniel and that of John, rests mainly upon the evidence of historical facts. The Roman power answers to the visionary portraiture; and no other does. If, then, it be admitted that the Roman kingdom is actually the object seen in Daniel's vision, we cannot question that its whole chronological duration is spread out before him. He sees it hieroglyphically represented from its rise to its fall. This is evident from the fact, that while the fourth Beast supervenes *immediately* upon the passing away of the third, the prophet beholds him notwithstanding in possession of his ten horns and under the domination of the eleventh, which was more than a thousand years subsequent to the date of his rise. Indeed, as he obviously looks onward through the lapse of the 1260 years of the Little Horn's prevalence against the saints, and as this must have commenced at least the same length of time after the founding of the Roman state by Romulus, the whole period embraced in the range of the vision cannot be less than ~~the~~ double of that term, or 2520 years. Consequently if John beheld in vision the same power, we

see no good reason to doubt that he saw it through the same extended tract of time : although, as he lived at a much later period, he might naturally be expected to give the principal prominence in his details, to the latter ages of its duration. And this he has undoubtedly done. Although we deem the entire chronology of the two visions as commensurate, yet it is the Beast in the latter moiety of his duration, while under the predominance of the Little Horn, that John more especially sets before us.

It is obvious that our only adequate clew to the solution of the symbols is to be found in the recorded historical facts pertaining to the Roman empire. Are these facts, viewed on a large scale, such as to accord with the imagery of the vision ? This is a question which can probably be determined without any extended array of historical detail. Nothing is more notorious than that the Roman empire, after subsisting not far from the space of 1260 years from its foundation, did succumb to the sword of its Gothic invaders, and about A. D. 476 became imperially extinct, under its then existing head. "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death." Consequently, we have no difficulty in understanding the drift of the angel's exposition in what he says of the Beast, as he "that was, and is not." The Roman dominion 'was,' as an actually subsisting power, and it 'was not,' when as an empire it was subjected to temporary excision by the sword of its northern conquerors.

Again, it is a fact of world-wide acknowledgment, that the empire, after remaining for a time in a state of political extinction, was again revived under a new ecclesiastico-imperial form. "And his deadly wound was healed." This is clearly intimated in the words of the angel ; "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit." This was his revivification. He came to life upon his issuing out of the "bottomless pit," centuries after his first appearance. In his original rise he emerged out of the sea ; and this was plainly embraced in the retrospective reach of the prophet's vision, as he tells us, ver. 1, "I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns," &c. It is true, his horns were of later acquisition, but this is simply to preserve the decorum of the imagery. The grand point upon which we here insist is, that his rising out of the bottomless pit or abyss (*ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*) was not the same with his rising out of the sea. It was his resurrection from the sword-inflicted death which he underwent at the hands of his barbarian conquerors. And this resurrection, we have not a question, was consummated in Charlemagne, in whose person the unity of the revived empire stands prominently forth. This fact affords, as we conceive, the true clew to what is said, Rev. 11: 17, respecting the two witnesses : "And when they shall have finished (rather, 'while they shall be finishing or accomplishing') their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless

pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. Nothing had before been said of this persecuting beast. The allusion is here proleptically introduced, and refers us to his emergence from the state of extinction to which he had been reduced by the stroke of the sword, which was fatal to one of his heads, and in that, to his entire life. The *ἀβυσσος* of the New Testament is in several instances equivalent to Hades, or the receptacle of the dead. See Rom. 10: 7; Luke 8: 31.

As it is well ascertained that the revival of the Roman empire as a Beast, was effected by the procurement of the ecclesiastical power, represented by the two-horned Beast of the vision, we find in this fact the realization of the mystic scenery thus depicted, Rev. 13: 11—17.

And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth: by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast: saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

This two-horned Beast is, we conceive, no other than the Romish hierarchy engaged in healing the deadly wound, or reviving the defunct dominion of the Cæsars, under which title Charlemagne is known in history. The remarks of Whiston (*Essay on Rev.* p. 229) give, we believe, the true scope of the symbolic action: "In the sixth vision we have, I think, a pretty plain account of the rise of the new empire, A. D. 800 (which is now become the German empire), and of its subordinate magistrates. This is here called 'an image of the beast which had the wound by a sword, and did live;' which wound is elsewhere said to be 'in the head of the beast.' That is, it is a resemblance or picture of the Roman empire when it was under the old Roman Cæsars, which had received the mortal wound by the barbarous nations; and yet the empire, the 'sacred Roman empire,' did afterwards continue in being; and on the rise of the imitation of the Cæsarean head, this empire became a perfect 'image' or likeness of the old Roman empire before it had received that mortal wound; which hereby, as it were, revived again, and appeared fresh in the world." He then goes on to observe, how perfectly the emperor's power in "uniting several

princes in upholding the remains of the Roman empire, and in executing the severe and sanguinary laws on those who departed from it, and would not submit to the papal and imperial tyranny and idolatry, was a fulfilment of the prophecy, that the image, thus animated, should 'cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.' To the whole he adds, from Sigonius, the very oath which the emperor took on the occasion of his coronation: "I, the emperor, do engage and promise, in the name of Christ, before God and the blessed apostle Peter, that I will be a protector and defender of this holy church of Rome, in all things wherein I can be useful to it, so far as divine assistance shall enable me, and so far as my knowledge and power shall reach."

The language of Gibbon on this head will show how exactly the facts answered to the purport of the prophecy: "By the conquest of Justinian we have been recalled to the banks of the Tiber, to the deliverance of the ancient metropolis; but that deliverance was a change, or perhaps an aggravation, of servitude. Rome had already been stripped of her trophies, her gods, and her Cæsars; nor was the Gothic dominion more oppressive and inglorious than that of the Greeks. In the eighth century of the Christian era, a religious quarrel, the worship of images, provoked the Romans to assert their independence; their bishop became the temporal as well as the spiritual father of a free people; and of the Western empire, which was *restored* by Charlemagne, the title and *image* still decorate the singular constitution of modern Germany." Indeed, we learn from his biographers that a commemorative coin was struck at Rome under the reign of Charlemagne, bearing the inscription, 'Renovatio Imperii Romani,' *Revival of the Roman Empire*.

But we have yet to compare with the page of history another item in the mystery of the Beast, as somewhat darkly unfolded to John, Rev. 17: 9—11.

Ἔσθ' ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἔχων σοφίαν. αἱ ἑπτὰ κεφαλαὶ ἑπτὰ ὄρη εἰσὶν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθεται ἐπ' αὐτῶν. Καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσιν· οἱ πέντε ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄλλος οὐκ ἔλθει, καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μείναι. Καὶ τὸ θηρίον, ὃ ἦν αἰὶς οὐκ ἔστι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔστι, καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει.

And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth. And they are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition.

It is doubtless a signal mistake of expositors to understand here by 'kings' any thing else than 'kingdoms,' for which 'kings' is the uniform equivalent term in this kind of figured prophecy. The seven kings, we conceive, are not seven forms of government

by kings, consuls, dictators, military tribunes, &c., for they are identified with seven mountains, and 'mountains' is a prophetic term for 'kingdoms,' considered more especially with reference to the *capitals* (from 'caput,' head) in which their power is concentrated. It is moreover worthy of remark that the heads are too conspicuously eminent on the scene to stand for either *hills* (λόφοι) or for past forms of a chiefly republican government. Besides, the official changes in the old pagan government of Rome seem too remote, insignificant, and irrelative, to be adverted to by a prophet of the Christian era, while portraying the modern universal empire. These heads surely represent kings more worthy to be called such than the various magistrates of heathen Rome. Their ashes can have little import in the present scene, but the *living remains* of kingdoms may. The Roman empire in the time of John had absorbed within itself the kingdoms and capitals of the great preceding dynasties of the world, which are said to be five, as identical with the five heads of the preceding Beasts, (giving one to the kingdoms of Babylon and Persia, because they had but one capital,) and four to the Grecian power, and Rome itself, made the sixth, which was the one slain with the sword. The other, not yet come, was to be the revived Roman empire, which, under its seventh head, or the kingdom of Charlemagne, was to endure but a short time *as a head*, but was to merge into the Beast itself, or its *body*, subsisting under what may be termed the *polyarchy* or *dekarchy* of the ten horns, or the ten independent sovereignties which formed the integrity of the Roman empire in its last state, which is more particularly set before us in the present vision of John. All this is certainly matter of *historic verity*, and it affords, we think, the true solution of the remarkable expression, "even he is the eighth, and is of the seven"—ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, i. e. not one of the previous seven kings, considered as a form of government, but *made up of the seven*, or in other words, a power comprising within itself, by absorption, the seven previous kingdoms represented by the heads, and yet existing under a new and unique form, in which, although there was no real *head*, as a centre of unity, yet there was a power, a dominion, an empire seated in the Beast himself, i. e. his body, of which the true actuating spirit was the Little Horn, or the Papacy, though this is nowhere termed a head of the Beast. This body is what the prophet calls 'the eighth.'

We are aware that this explanation is somewhat complicated, but this arises from the nature of the subject, which is in itself extremely complicated. It is hardly possible to specify any thing more anomalous than the different phases through which the Roman empire passed from age to age, in consequence of its singular connexion with the church. Any symbolic device which should suitably represent it, must inevitably be more or less enigmatical, and require 'the mind which hath wisdom' to decipher it. Yet

nothing is more indubitable than that that empire is recognised as still subsisting in the eye of prophecy, and as destined to subsist till superseded by the everlasting kingdom of the saints. But it is clear that for centuries past the Roman empire has not existed under a united imperial head, but rather as a huge *body*, composed of the separate kingdoms represented by the ten horns, and having its visionary life diffused over this body, instead of being concentrated in a head, as it was before its extinction by the sword of its Herulic and Ostrogothic 'slaughtermen,' and as it was for a short time under the emperor Charlemagne, subsequent to whose era this revived head fades and dies away in the extra-Italian line of Germanic potentates.

We have found, then, by this process of investigation the 'body' of the Beast which, according to Daniel, is to be 'given to the burning flame,' and according to John, to be 'cast into the lake of fire burning with brimstone.' This is the same catastrophe with that so repeatedly indicated by the phrase 'goeth into perdition;' and as this form of expression is of great importance to our explanation of the prophecy, we shall trace it a little more in detail. The original term is for the most part some form of ἀπολλύμι, *to destroy, waste, consume*, and it is to be noted that in all the following passages the reference is to one and the same subject: Dan. 7: 11, "And I beheld till the beast was *destroyed* (ἀπωλέτο, *went into perdition*), and his body given to the burning flame;" Dan. 7: 25, "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and *to destroy* (Gr. ἀπολέσαι) it unto the end." 2 Thess. 2: 8, "Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall *consume* (Gr. ἀναλώσει) with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." Rev. 17: 8, "The beast that thou sawest was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and *go into perdition* (Gr. εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει)." Rev. 17: 11, "The beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and *goeth into perdition* (Gr. εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει)."

This is the doom ordained for the *body* of the Beast, or that headless assemblage of political sovereignties which constitute the Roman empire in its latter periods. It is the doom which is the result of the celestial, i. e. the terrestrial, judgment that sits for a long series of ages in the providence of God upon this rampant and desolating dominion. And in what form shall we suppose this dire calamity to be visited upon the Beast, but that of *war*? Is it not a fact, 'known and read of all men,' that the history of Europe, for centuries back, has been mainly a history of wars, revolutions, and bloodshed? Has there not been in this way a process of constant 'consumption' and 'destruction' going on among those nations that constituted the integrity of the old Roman empire? And suppose that this peculiar mode of infliction were de-

plants himself upon the principles of a just interpretation, has a solemn right to be heard on that ground, and he who replies to his reasonings by simply arraying against him the *odium theologicum*, virtually admits that he *cannot* encounter him with the appropriate weapons.

For ourselves, we repeat that we differ most essentially from the leading conclusions of Dr. Duffield. But we should feel that in controverting them we were bound to state what we thought the disputed passages *did* mean, as well as what they *did not*, and both this and his former work evince most unequivocally, that he would never think of meeting us in case of a debate on any other ground. B.

PROPHECY INTERPRETED LITERALLY OR SPIRITUALLY; or the *Millenist and Millenarian Views of Scriptural Interpretation*. Baltimore : D. Owen & Son.

THIS is a pamphlet of some seventy pages, containing on the back cover an intimation of its being an *extra* of the SPIRIT OF THE XIX CENTURY, an original monthly periodical conducted by the Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, D. D., Baltimore. It is a very able and skilful balancing of the evidence in favor of the two modes of Literal and Spiritual Interpretation. The leanings of the author can perhaps be dimly discerned to the former principle, but he evinces so much sobriety of judgment, and holds the rein with such a firm grasp over all the tendencies to a rash commitment, that his work has far more the air of the carefully-pondered decision of the judge, than of the partisan plea of the advocate. It is the production of one who has profoundly studied the subject, and the amount of information which he brings to the discussion, and which is especially displayed in an incidental way in the notes, is very great. B.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE SECOND ADVENT. *By the Rev. Hugh White, Dublin*. New-York: Robert Carter. 12mo. pp. 240.

THIS is what its title imports, not an argumentative treatise on the doctrine of the Second Personal Advent of the Saviour prior to the Millennium, but a series of rich practical reflections, such as are calculated to impress deeply the pious mind in case that *should* perchance be the true teaching of Revelation on the subject; a contingency which we should judge the author deems not improbable. He writes at any rate as if he thought the evidence stronger on that head than it appears to be to us. But the work is admirable in tone, drift, and unction. B.



# CONTENTS OF THE FIRST FIVE NUMBERS.

## No. I.—JUNE.

Introductory,	1
The Millennium and the New Jerusalem,	4
Prophecy Intelligible,	15
Commentary on the Psalms.—Ps. IV.	20
Notices of New Publications,	
Robinson's ed. of Tittman and Hahn's Gr. Testament,	
English Reprints.	23

## No. II.—JULY.

The Millennium and the New Jerusalem,	25
Prophecy Intelligible,	34
Commentary on the Psalms.—Ps. IV.	39
The Exegete.—No. I.	
Explanation of Col. 2: 8,	45
Jude 3,	46
Notices of New Publications,	
Stuart's Hints on Interpretation,	46
Folsom on the Prophecies of Daniel,	47
Duffield's Dissertations on the Prophecies,	48
Bush's Notes on Leviticus,	48

## No. III.—AUGUST.


The Millennium and the New Jerusalem.—Conflagration of the Heavens and the Earth,	49
Reply to the New-York Evangelist,	64
Notices.	
To our Readers,	72
Notes on Leviticus,	72

## No. IV.—SEPTEMBER.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter I. to Prof. Stuart,	73
The Pre-Millennial Advent of Christ.	
Remarks,	85
The Judgement of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints,	89

## No. V.—OCTOBER.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter II. to Prof. Stuart,	97
The Judgment of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints— <i>Continued</i> ,	103
Commentary on the Psalms.—Ps. IV.,	110
The Pre-Millennial Advent of Christ— <i>Second Article</i> ,	115
Notices of New Publications.	
Robinson's Bibliotheca Sacra,	116
Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia,	119
Redfield's Pictorial Bible,	120
Chalmers' Lectures on Romans,	120



THE present number of the Hierophant will be received by some beyond the circle of our subscribers, to whom it is addressed simply for the purpose of bringing it, and its general object and character, to their notice. If upon examination they should decline taking it for the year, they will confer a favor by returning the number, per mail, to the Editor. We can furnish the back Nos. to new subscribers to a small—and but a small—extent, as a thousand copies is the limit of our impression. When the volume is completed, there is not at present the least probability that a *single copy* can be obtained by purchase. To those who may wish to possess themselves of a series of Biblical discussions upon which unusual care has been bestowed, the present is probably the only opportunity. The sequel of the exposition of the 7th chapter of Daniel, we do not hesitate to say, will be of deep interest to the student of prophecy; and such of necessity is every one who is a student of the Bible. This portion of the prophetic visions sweeps into its comprehensive range that whole class of disclosures which relate to the Second Coming of Christ—the End of the World—the Judgment—the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints, etc., together with many kindred predictions of the Apocalypse. These are topics to which no reflecting christian mind can be indifferent; and they are treated in our pages, not with overweening confidence, but according to the measure of light which a somewhat patient and prolonged investigation has afforded.

Orders to be addressed to the Editor or Publisher.

---

#### LIST OF AGENTS.

MAINE.—*Portland*, William Hyde.

*Bangor*, E. F. Duren.

MASSACHUSETTS.—*Boston*, Saxton & Pierce.

*Salem*, John P. Jewett.

*Andover*, W. Wardwell.

RHODE-ISLAND.—*Providence*, O. Wilmarth.

CONNECTICUT.—*Hartford*, James W. Judd.

NEW-JERSEY.—*Princeton*, S. N. Howell.